IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MELVIN DUKES,

No. C 09-04579 SBA (PR)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CONTINUED INTENT TO PROSECUTE THIS ACTION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

J. SELBIL, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff filed the instant pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, and in an Order dated September 4, 2009, Magistrate Judge Dale A. Drozd of the Eastern District transferred this action to this Court. On October 1, 2009, the Clerk of the Court informed Plaintiff that this case had been transferred to the Northern District.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), a district court may sua sponte dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with a court order. See Link v. Wabash R.R., 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962); McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 795, 797 (9th Cir. 1991). But such a dismissal should only be ordered when the failure to comply is unreasonable. See id. A district court should afford the litigant prior notice of its intention to dismiss. See Malone v. United States Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 133 (9th Cir. 1987).

In the instant case, Plaintiff has failed to communicate with the Court since this case has been transferred to the Northern District. Furthermore, the October 1, 2009 notice was returned as undeliverable on October 8, 2009 with a notation: "Return to Sender -- Inmate Refused." Accordingly, it is in the interests of justice and judicial efficiency for the Court to establish whether Plaintiff intends to continue to prosecute this action. Plaintiff shall file a notice of his continued intent to prosecute no later than thirty (30) days of the date of this Order. Failure to do so will result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice for failure to prosecute under Rule 41(b) of

For the Northern District of California **United States District Court**

tł
tł
Γ

the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See 1	Malone, 833 F.2d at 133 (the district court should afford
the litigant prior notice before dismissing for	or failure to prosecute).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 10/26/09	SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG United States District Judge

28

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
3	MELVIN DUKES,	
4	Case Number: CV09-04579 SBA Plaintiff,	
5	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.	
6	J SELBIL et al,	
7	Defendant.	
8		
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.	
11	That on October 28, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said	
12	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle	
13	located in the Clerk's office.	
14		
15	Melvin Dukes D-33572 Salinas Valley State Prison (1050)	
16	P.O. Box 1050 Soledad, CA 93960-1050	
17	Dated: October 28, 2009	
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		